The examiner has objected to the specification noting that numerous spelling errors exist.

By this amendment, all such errors found have been corrected.

The examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph noting that a variety of elements lack antecedent basis.

Significant corrections have been made to claim 1. These corrections formulate the claim in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1, as now amended, fully complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 4, and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) citing the Tan et al. reference.

Tan approaches the structure in the traditional fashion. Within Tan, the inductive element is located after the rectifiers. The role of the inductive element within Tan is to filter the output current (in conjunction with the capacitor).

> "...The inductor 36 of the filter 34 continues to provide a current to the output load, thereby keeping Vout approximately constant" (col. 8, lines 7-12)

With the current invention, the inductor is located before the rectifiers (between the rectifiers and the transformer. In this position, the inductor does not filter, rather it controls the current flow from the primary to the secondary. The inductor controls the change in the transfer function.

As now amended, the positioning of the inductor between the transformer and the rectifiers within the present invention is clear:

> "... b) an inductive element connected in series with said AC source;
>
> c) a bridge having a first, a second, a third, and a fourth rectifier, said bridge having a first input terminal, ... said first input terminal communicating with said inductive element ..." (claim 1, amended, lines 4-8)

Further, the current within the present invention flows bi-directionally. Tan's apparatus is designed to restrict flow to a single direction (a typical filtering operation).

The function and objective of the present invention is clearly different than Tan's. Movement of the inductor of Tan would totally eliminate the purpose of Tan.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 4, and 6 are not anticipated by Tan and further that Tan is incapable of teaching or suggesting these claims.

The examiner has rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) citing Tan.

Claim 5 is ultimately dependent upon claim 1, which has been shown to be presumably allowable; Claim 5 is therefore presumably allowable.

Further, claim 5, claims that the inductive element does not reach zero. This is counter to Tans objective of "... keeping Vout approximately constant ..." (col. 8, lines 11-12).

It is respectfully submitted that claim 5 is not taught or suggested by Tan.

The examiner has rejected claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) citing Tan in combination of Cowett. The examiner comments that "Cowett shows a rectifier comprised of controlled switches".

The examiner is correct as to the teachings of Cowett. This teaching though does not cure the problem already noted and discussed relative to Tan. In fact, Cowett doesn't have an inductor anywhere near its "controlled switches".

It is respectfully submitted that claims 2 and 3 are not taught or suggested by either Tan or Cowett, whether taken singly or in combination.

The examiner has rejected claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) citing Tan in view of Stacey. The examiner comments that Stacey shows a rectifier with controlled switches.

The examiner's observation is correct; but, this is all that Stacey teaches. It does not show the use of an inductor before the rectifiers. As such, Stacey is totally incapable of correcting the deficiencies already noted relative to Tan.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 2 and 3 are not taught or suggested by either Tan or Stacey, whether these references are taken singly or in combination.

The examiner has rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) citing Tan in combination with Schutten.

The deficiencies of Tan have already been described and discussed. Schutten's teaching of figure 1, ("bi-direction switch (16) of figure 1 that switches to position A or B to assist in shaping the output waveform", examiner's comments) does nothing to cure the problems of Tan. In fact, Schutten doesn't use an inductor at all but rather connects the load to the output of the rectifier structure (see Figure 1 of Schutten)

It is respectfully submitted that claim 7 is neither taught or suggested by either Tan or Schutten, whether taken singly or in combination.

The other references supplied by the examiner have been reviewed and they are not felt able to cure the problems already noted above.

Based upon the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-7, as now amended, are allowable and should be advanced to issuance.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mark E. Ogram
Attorney at Law
Reg. No. 30343

Date: 5/23/00

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 CFR 1.8)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, on May 23, 1998 2000.

Mark E. Ogram, reg. no. 30343

Date 5/23/00